The Episcopal Church

ITS DOCTRINE, MINISTRY, DISCIPLINE, WORSHIP AND SACRAMENTS

By George Hodges

No. 264

St. Paul's Sunday School Library

RULES.

1. Scholars must be members of the Sunday School one month before taking out books.

2. Only one book at a time may be taken.

3. Books may not be kept for a longer period than two weeks, without special permission.

4. Books must not be abused, nor exchanged anywhere but at the library by the Librarian.

5. Failure to comply with the rules will forfeit the privileges of the library.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/episcopalchurch0000geor_s1k2

DEAN HODGES' WORKS.

THE BATTLES OF PEACE (Sermons). 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

IN THE PRESENT WORLD (Sermons). 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

THE HERESY OF CAIN (Sermons). 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

CHRISTIANITY BETWEEN SUNDAYS (Sermons). 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

FAITH AND SOCIAL SERVICE. Lowell Lectures, 1896. 12mo, cloth, gilt top, $1.25.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH; Its Doctrine, its Ministry, its Discipline, its Worship and its Sacraments. 12mo, paper, 25 cents; cloth, 50 cents.

BESIDE THE CROSS. Good Friday Meditations. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.

THOMAS WHITTAKER,
PUBLISHER.

THE

EPISCOPAL CHURCH;

ITS DOCTRINE, ITS MINISTRY,

ITS DISCIPLINE,

ITS WORSHIP, AND ITS SACRAMENTS.

BY

GEORGE HODGES, D. D.,

DEAN OF THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL,
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

"And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and the prayers."
—Acts ii. 42.

NEW YORK:
THOMAS WHITTAKER,
2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE.

Copyright 1892.
by
THOMAS WHITTAKER.

EIGHTH EDITION.

The Lambeth Articles.

I.

The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the ultimate rule and standard of faith.

II.

The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

III.

The two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

IV.

The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration, to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called by God into the Unity of His Church.

CONTENTS.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH, . . Page 11

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH, . . " 27

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH, . . " 45

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH, . . " 63

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH, . " 79

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

And Philip said, Understandest thou what thou readest? And he said, How can I except some man should guide me?—Acts viii. 30, 31.

§ 1. One of the purposes for which the Church exists is to do for all of us what Philip did for the man of Ethiopia. The Church is meant to be our guide. The book, which we are reading, has more in it than the Ethiopian's book, which probably contained only the chapters of Isaiah. It is larger even than the Old and New Testaments together. It includes the book of Holy Scripture, and the book of Nature, and the long commentary on them both which is written by experience. It is the book of life.

The Ethiopian asked Philip to interpret for him. He was in doubt as to the meaning of the book. And Philip, taking that old writing into his hands, and reading it with a new emphasis, showed how the heart of it is Christ. Thus Philip helped the Ethiopian by selecting out of that great prophecy of Isaiah its point of chief importance.

There are many ways in which the book of Isaiah may be profitably studied. Philip might have said a great deal about the magnificent historical background of the chapter which the man was reading. He might have discussed certain critical and literary

questions which are debated among scholars as to the authorship of the paragraph upon which the Ethiopian had his finger. The meaning of *prophecy* and the definition of *inspiration* might have been considered between them as they rode along together. Instead of that, Philip singled out the spiritual meaning and the practical application of the words. He taught his congregation of one exactly that which it was most important he should know. That is, the chief characteristic of Philip's doctrine that day, when he turned an Ethiopian chariot into a Christian pulpit, was its wise discrimination.

The Episcopal Church does just what Philip did—selects out, emphasizes, discriminates. The formal statement of the elements of the Christian faith is set forth by this Church in the two creeds—in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. All that the Church considers essential to right faith is contained within the compass of these two brief symbols. This choice of the two creeds as the sufficient statement of Christian doctrine involves a threefold discrimination. It makes a distinction in the matter of doctrine between the essential and the unessential, and between the transitory and the permanent, and between the beginning and the end.

1. The Episcopal Church makes a clear distinction between what is essential and what is not essential, in Christian doctrine.

The difference between the essential and the unessential is not a difference in truth but in importance. It is true that the presence of steam will set a machine in motion. It is also true that the spires of Cologne

Cathedral are thirty-seven feet higher than the pyramid of Cheops. But there is a considerable difference between the value of these truths to mankind at large.

So it is with the truths of religion. The Episcopal Church teaches a great many different truths. Some of them have regard to ritual. They are statements of the opinion of this Church as to the most helpful ways of conducting the services and administering the sacraments. Every page of the Prayer Book teaches doctrine of this kind. And to all this, for the sake of reverence and order, the Church attaches a certain importance, but not a chief importance. Nobody who comes into the Church is required to believe anything in particular about ritual. Not a question is asked for the purpose of securing allegiance to any kind of rite or ceremony.

Some other truths which the Church teaches have to do more directly with theology. They are statements that were drawn up by the leaders of the Church in the midst of the doctrinal controversies of the Reformation. They represent, as a matter of history, the positions that were then taken. They are contained in the Thirty-Nine Articles. The Thirty-Nine Articles in the Episcopal Church correspond to the Westminster Confession of Faith, and to the Decrees of the Council of Trent. Except in this: that they are presented for information, not for required acceptance. There they are. But no member of the Episcopal Church is ever asked if he believes them; neither does any minister of the Episcopal Church set his signature to them.

All these lesser truths of ritual and of theology are

forever open to revision. They might be set aside to-morrow and the Episcopal Church would go on unchanged. Even the Prayer Book and the Thirty-Nine Articles are not vital parts of the Episcopal Church. But the two creeds are. The bishops at the Chicago convention and afterwards at the Lambeth conference, setting forth the essential things which this Church holds to, left all these lesser matters out. But they insisted on the creeds.

2. The second wise discrimination in doctrine which the Church makes is between the transitory and the permanent. The two creeds are simple, unelaborated and unargued statements of facts.

There is not to be found in either of the creeds any doctrine of the Trinity, nor of the incarnation, nor of the atonement. God is, indeed, spoken of as Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Jesus Christ is declared to be the Son of God, conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, God of God, as light comes from light, very God of very God. And it is affirmed that he came from heaven for our salvation, and that he suffered for us under Pontius Pilate. But we will look in vain for any theory of the Trinity, such as is to be read in that other creed, which the Church did not see fit to set in the Prayer Book, called the Athanasian. We will look in vain for any metaphysical explanation of the incarnation. We will look in vain for any theory of the atonement. How it is that the death of Christ effects a reconciliation between God and man, the creeds do not try to say.

Thus we are left at liberty to think. The facts are testified to: the inferences are left to our own reason.

The door to intellectual progress is set wide open. Not a hindrance is laid in the way of free discussion, of perfectly untrammelled consideration, of these great truths. Our Lord, when he taught the twelve, told them just enough to set them thinking. Because he wanted them to think. That is what he gave us brains and minds for. And the Church has followed that preëminent example.

There is not a theory about the Trinity, nor about the incarnation, nor about the atonement, held in the Church to-day, which might not be forsaken to-morrow, in the light of some clearer revelation of the meaning of the facts, and the Church go straight on. That is one of the reasons for the intellectual hospitality of the Episcopal Church. This blessed discrimination, which sets the simple creeds above all philosophizings about them, makes it possible to welcome all manner of new truth from every side, as a help and not a hindrance, as an increasing contribution to our understanding of the facts. Theory after theory has given away to deeper spiritual knowledge, and will give way in future. But facts never give way. And the Church, holding to the great creeds, and to these alone, grows with the growth of man.

3. The third excellent discrimination which the Episcopal Church makes in matters of doctrine, is in its emphasis upon the difference between the beginning and the end.

For there are two creeds. And while the same truth is taught in both, it is not taught in the same way. The Nicene Creed is longer, more elaborate, more difficult than the Apostles' Creed. And the Church

uses the two creeds in different ways. Thus the creed that is used in the service of Baptism and of Confirmation is the shorter. The one that is appointed for the service of the Holy Communion is the longer. The bishops of the Church who met at Lambeth, and set forth in the interests of Christian unity the essential position of the Episcopal Church, defined the Apostles' Creed as the "baptismal symbol," and the Nicene Creed as the "sufficient statement of the Christian faith." And that is what I mean by the difference between the beginning and the end.

The Church recognizes the fact, to which all human experience testifies, of a natural growth in faith. All healthy people grow in spiritual understanding as they grow in strength of mind. The Episcopal Church, accordingly, does not ask so much, in the matter of doctrine, of those who come newly into the Church, as is asked afterwards. The only creed which is to be recited at the Church door is the brief creed of the apostles. Then, as the ideal statement of the Christian faith, an ideal little by little realized as the years go by, is set the creed of the Council of Nicæa.

It was discovered long ago in the history of the Church that the Apostles' Creed is wide enough to let in people of quite questionable orthodoxy. And at the beginning of the fourth century there had to be a great council held to frame a statement of the faith of the Christian Church which should be a more sufficient statement, which should more fully and adequately express the truth about God to which the Church from the beginning had borne witness. And thus came into existence the creed of Nicæa. And

that creed was appointed to be used, in refutation of all misunderstanding, as the creed of the matured and instructed Christian, as the creed of the communicant.

Nevertheless, the Apostles' Creed was left just as it was. It was not torn up, nor burned, nor put out of the Church. It was still kept as the wide gate of entrance. The Church trusts in the grace of God and in the spiritual instincts of man. The Church recognizes the need of making provision for the difference between Christian childhood and Christian maturity; between the minimum and the maximum; between the faith of John, the fisherman of Galilee, and the faith of John, the beloved disciple; between the beginning and the end.

The doctrine of the Church, then, is to be looked for in the two creeds. The heart of the creeds is Christ. The middle part of both creeds tells us who Christ is and what he did. The first part and the last tells us what Christ taught.

§ 2. This is a good place in which to make a brief explanation of the meaning of several articles of the creeds which are easily open to misunderstanding.

1. "He descended into hell." There are two words in the original languages of the Bible which in our authorized English version are translated "hell." One is *gehenna,* which means "the place of punishment." The other is *hades,* which means "the place of departed spirits." The word in the creed has the second of these meanings. The article is a strong statement of the reality of the death of Christ. He was buried —his body was put into the grave; and he descended into hell—his soul went into the place of departed

spirits. Associated also with this article is the belief, which is suggested by various passages of Holy Scripture, that heaven does not follow immediately after the death even of the faithful, but that all souls wait in Paradise till the kingdom of God shall come.

2. "The Communion of Saints" is another article in which it is possible to read the same suggestion as to the life which follows death. Death does not separate the soul from the Church of Christ. We who are here and they who have gone before join in prayer and adoration in the presence of the same God.

3. "The forgiveness of sins" does not mean a change in the sinner's condition as regards his sin; there is no interruption between cause and consequence; there is no denial of the text which tells us that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." The change is in the relation between the sinner and the heavenly Father. The sinner turns away from God. He sets a separation between himself and God. But the love of God is unceasing. And whenever any sinner turns back, and is sorry, and loves God again, the Father in heaven has an instant welcome for him. He is not the same as if he had not sinned. He may, indeed, be the better for that fall and the lesson it has taught him. But he is forgiven. There is mutual love again between God and the sinner.

4. As for the "resurrection of the body," we may interpret that according to the sense of Holy Scripture. St. Paul says that the body with which we will be clothed in the resurrection is not the body which is put into the grave. God will give us another body, a

spiritual body. And yet in identity the same body, as a plant and the seed out of which it grows are essentially the same. And capable of recognition, even as Christ after his resurrection, having a body possessing new and marvellous properties, was yet known by those who loved him.

5. "And the life everlasting." There is no word in either of the creeds about the death everlasting. That punishment will continue just as long as sin continues, is a truth which is plain and inevitable. Sin always brings punishment, and must always bring punishment, to all eternity. And since man has the power of choice, and with it the power of choosing evil, and, so far as we can see, must for the perfection of his nature have that power everlastingly, there is a possibility of everlasting sin, and, accordingly, of everlasting punishment. And there are words in Holy Scripture which read as if there might be such an everlasting fact of human and even divine failure as everlasting punishment. Some people think that the hard texts are capable of other readings; and that all the prodigal sons of God will at last return to their Father's home, and obedience, and love; and that hell itself will be abolished. The creeds set no negative to this doctrine of eternal hope.

§ 3. It remains to consider what is the foundation of our belief in these essential statements of the Christian faith. Christ is not only the heart of the creeds, but he is the supreme teacher upon whose assurance we rely when doubts assail us.

That over all is God, we may believe without the help of the testimony of Christ. The existence of God

is the most reasonable inference, going back from effect to cause, that can be drawn from the order and growth of nature and from the mind and soul of man. And that God is almighty, so that he can do all things which belong to the realms of power and righteousness, might also have been guessed at, and is not difficult of acceptation. And that God is the maker of heaven and earth—this, too, the profoundest thinkers have found consistent with their deepest researches.

But that God is our Father—that God really cares for us, really loves us, his children, here we get into the range of hard questions. Here we may have need of help. For sometimes our consciousness says "yes" and sometimes "no," to the Fatherhood of God. It makes a great difference whether it is day or night, whether prosperity or adversity attends us. Who is there who has not asked in the hour of darkness, in the midst of pain, and sorrow—Does God care? We want somebody who really knows to tell us. And we accept that blessed truth, putting the doubts away, not because we have reasoned out the problem of pain and got a logical and satisfying answer, but because we have realized that Jesus Christ knows more about that than we ever can, and we have been contented to accept his word.

And that God will forgive our sins, and that He will raise us up after death to life eternal—who has thought out these deep and hidden truths? Who has dared to set sin and salvation, and life and death, together, and to say as the result of his own reasoning, "I know." Doubts and difficulties gather about us, and we are not metaphysicians, we are not theologians,

we have no answer to these perplexing questions. What shall we do, then? Why, let us listen to the Master. Where is the wise man, where is the philosopher, whom we can trust to solve these problems for us like the Lord Jesus Christ. Our certainty that these assertions of the creeds are true, our acceptance of these unspeakably important truths, and our foundation of our life and destiny thereon, rests on our faith in Jesus Christ.

That is what faith does. It makes it possible for us to accept upon the word of some one whom we trust, that which we can not or do not verify. This helpful faith is as universal as humanity. We are all the time accepting statements which we can not or do not verify upon the word of some one whom we trust. This is one of the conditions of our thinking. We can not get along without it. Probably nine-tenths of all the truths that we know rest upon the basis of faith. Most geographical truth evidently does. Most scientific truth does also. We have to depend upon the travellers and upon the men who have the time and skill to make experiments. We have neither opportunity, nor money, nor ability, to work out many of the hard problems for our own selves. We accept the solutions of the scientific masters.

But Christian faith is not different in its nature from any other kind of faith. It is, first, supreme trust in a person; and then, following naturally after that, an assured acceptance of the truth of what that person says. Faith carries into the spiritual world that inevitable recognition of the necessity of dependence on testimony by which we live every day in the

intellectual world. Christian faith is trust in the supreme spiritual Master.

He who taught in Galilee spake as man never spake. After all the centuries of growth and enlightenment and progress, Jesus Christ is still he who has uttered the ultimate word. Never has mistake been found in him. Never has truth in religion been discovered anywhere, among all the creeds, all the philosophies, which we do not find in the brief record of his life. Jesus Christ knew more about those truths which are spiritually discerned than all the saints of all time have ever dreamed of. And he said that God loves us, that salvation from sin is possible, and that after death is life everlasting.

And the Church sets this assurance, this revelation, of Christ here in the creed. And there are no arguments set down beside it. Christ said it. The man who lived the one ideal life of all history said it. The prëeminent teacher of all the race said it. The Son of God said it. Can we do better, who are so far beneath him in even our highest spiritual attainments, —can we do better than to commit to him the solution of the problems, to take his word, to trust him, and to rest content in the absolute assurance that when he said he knew, he knew indeed.

In the English Revolution of the 18th century, when the two great armies, the English and the Scotch, lay facing one another at Dunbar, and the moment came for battle, the war-cry of the Scotch was "The Covenant! The Covenant!" Their shout was for the defense of that elaborate and difficult formulation of metaphysical theology. But the battle-cry of

Cromwell was "The Lord of Hosts!" And Cromwell won. That victorious watchword will always win. The heart of the creed is Jesus Christ our Lord. He is the beginning and the middle and the end of the doctrine of the Church.

NOTE.—I am indebted to the Rev. W. L. Bull for the suggestion that a statement made on page 18 is open to misunderstanding. The statement is that "the forgiveness of sins does not mean a change in the sinner's condition as regards his sin." The purpose of that sentence is to guard against the error that by the act of forgiveness the sinner becomes at once a saint. It is possible, however, to so read it as to make it appear that the fact of pardon leaves the past to be forever reckoned against the sinner; whereas, in truth, the blessing of forgiveness introduces a new force into the life of the sinner such as should in time deliver him out of the consequences of his sinful past.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH.

He called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles.—Luke vi. 13.

That was the beginning of the Christian ministry. Ever since that day there have been two kinds of Christians, disciples and apostles. The difference between a disciple and an apostle is that one is a learner, and the other, while still a learner, is also an official teacher. These twelve were thenceforth the accredited messengers, the commissioned representatives, of Jesus Christ.

From that day on, the time and attention of our Lord were chiefly occupied with the training of these twelve apostles. Christ wrote no book; it was not in that way that he provided for the preservation of his work. Neither did he preach a great deal to large congregations over wide extents of country; it was not by his own preaching that he sought to secure the propagation of his doctrine. What he did was to train these twelve. He devoted himself almost entirely to that. The twelve lived with him. He took them with him among the Syrian villages. They heard his wonderful, revealing and inspiring words; they saw his works of marvel and mercy. They looked into his face every day and were constantly within the reach of his personal influence. Sometimes he led them apart

from all other people, into a quiet place where he could teach them and answer their questions. Sometimes he sent them away, that they might go about and tell what he had told them. From the hour when he selected these twelve men he devoted himself to their spiritual education. And by and by, when the time came for him to go away out of the world's sight, he left these men to carry on his work.

It is evident, then, that Jesus Christ not only appointed ministers, but that he emphasized the fact of appointment. He did not say that day to the multitude of his disciples, "Whoever here is persuaded in his mind of the truth of my teachings, and has a longing in his heart to tell that truth to some brother of his, let him go and be my apostle." And yet he did want them every one to do that apostolic work. He knew well that the Church would not grow very fast if all its missionary work were monopolized by twelve ministers. Every Christian, then and now, in proportion to the genuineness and depth of his Christian spirit, will be a Christian minister. Nevertheless, Christ chose a definite number, twelve; and appointed them and no others. And he admitted them into exclusive privileges, and laid upon them special responsibilities. Evidently, Jesus Christ believed that his truth would best be taught, and his work best carried on, not by leaving everything to chance, but by providing authoritative, official, and publicly appointed representatives.

The question is sometimes raised as to whether the ministry of the Church in its various grades, the organization of ecclesiastical government, is of divine

or of human ordering. Did Christ, in his conversations with these his representatives, arrange for them how they were to meet all the needs of their work? or did the apostles, meeting these needs, knowing the spirit of Christ, and depending on the guidance of God, dispose matters as the occasion demanded?

We are in danger of mistake when we try to draw lines of distinction between the divine and the human. Especially are we in sure peril of error when we base our reasonings upon the assumption that the only real work of God in the world is done miraculously. The truth is that God is forever working in the affairs of man, sometimes directly, but far more often indirectly. Indeed, it is a general law, an observed habit of God, that he works almost always through men. He makes us his instruments. It is not likely that Jesus Christ planned out for the apostles all the details of the organization of the Christian Church; partly because they showed themselves in doubt as to some most important details, and had to assemble in general convention to debate them; and partly because it is not God's way to tell us what we can find out for our own selves. It is significant that Jesus did not go about as Paul did, ordaining elders in every city and setting things in order when he came; but that he simply chose these twelve, and made himself the centre of this little company of friends, and thus, as it might seem, avoided the setting of the pattern of an ecclesiastical organization, that he might leave the future free. The probability is that the Church came into shape to fit the exigencies of the Christian work. When there arose a misunderstanding among certain

members of the Church over failures in the matter of fair distribution of alms among the needy, the apostles, as the most natural and satisfactory solution of the difficulty, appointed deacons to have that part of the work of the ministry as their special service. And thus there came to be two orders of ministers, apostles and deacons.

When the apostles, journeying about from place to place, preaching, making converts, baptizing, felt the need of local teachers and pastors, who could represent them as they represented Christ, they appointed presbyters. And then there were three orders of ministers—apostles, or general ministers; presbyters, or local ministers; and deacons, or assistant ministers. That great emphasis was laid upon this three-fold ministry, or that the practical advantage of it was universally and strongly realized, is evident from the fact that the Church adopted it everywhere unanimously. These three kinds of ministers appear in the New Testament. Then follows a considerable time, a century or two, of unrecorded history, and when, after that, the Church comes out again into the clear light, these three kinds of ministers are still found unmistakably all over Christendom—the general ministers, the local ministers, and the assistant ministers —doing the work of Christ.

The men who set in order the ministry of the Christian Church may have had the express word of Christ for every smallest detail of it. He may have given them instructions in ecclesiastical polity during the forty days after the resurrection. It is certain that they had the spirit of Christ. And that is the

only certain thing about it. Except this—that whether God worked in this case by the word of his divine Son, or by the good Christian sense of his human apostles, God worked in it. The ministry of the Christian Church was ordained of God.

I am chiefly concerned just here, however, to insist upon the fact that he who out of all the apostles definitely chose twelve to be accredited representatives, thereby laid emphasis upon the importance of regular appointment.

Accordingly, the Christians of the days of the apostles, are described as people who continued steadfastly not only in the apostles' doctrine, but in the apostles' fellowship. And this fellowship appears to mean an acceptance of these regularly appointed ministers of the Lord's own choosing as their acknowledged teachers and pastors. Thus, for example, a Christian in Ephesus, in the years when St. John the Apostle lived in that city, would be in the apostles' fellowship so long as he continued to be a devout communicant of the church to which St. John ministered. If for any reason, good or bad, he separated himself from St. John, and attached himself to some other teacher not appointed by St. John, or, at least, not appointed in the regular way, he thereby departed from the apostles' fellowship.

The apostles' fellowship was that religious society which Christ himself founded by appointing its first officers, and which we call the Church. A man became a minister in the church by being appointed in the regular way. And a christian continued in the communion of the Church so long as he had for his

teacher and pastor one thus appointed. It was considered of great importance that a minister should be regularly appointed.

Now, in the case of the twelve apostles, there is no difficulty as to the regularity of their appointment. And the question is almost as plain and easy of decision in the case of those whom the apostles themselves appointed. It is when we get away from the days of the apostles that we get into obscurity. That obscurity to-day is, unfortunately, very dense, indeed. Naturally the question of validity of appointment comes up most often in relation not to the general ministers, who represent the apostles, nor to the assistant ministers, who represent the deacons of the New Testament, but in relation to the local ministers, whose numbers are so much greater, and who, to so many people, are the only ministers with whom they come in contact—the presbyters.

What, then, is the right, valid, and accredited manner of appointing these ministers? To this there are to-day four answers coming from as many divisions of the Christian world. There is the Roman answer: the Romanist says that the power of appointment is in the hands of one man, the bishop of bishops, the pope. There is the Episcopalian answer: the Episcopalian says that the power of appointment is in the hands of a considerable number of men, the apostles, or, as they have long been called, the bishops. There is the Presbyterian answer: the Presbyterian says that the power of appointment is in the hands of a greater number of men than that, in the hands of the local ministers themselves, the presbyters. Finally, there

is the Congregational answer: the Congregationalist holds that the power of appointment is not in the hands of the pope alone, nor of the bishops alone, nor even of the presbyters alone, but of all the people, of the congregation. The consequence is that the Christian Church is separated into at least four great and seemingly irreconcilable divisions. Each of these divisions emphasizes, as our Lord did, the importance of a rightly appointed ministry. But each says, "This is the right way by which ministers should be appointed." Which is the right way?

§ 2. To this question the authoritative answer of the Episcopal Church is simply that our way is the old way; yes, the oldest, the original way. The preface to that part of the Prayer Book in which is contained the form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating bishops, priests and deacons, declares that "it is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the apostles' time there have been three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore held in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority." And this lawful authority, in the case of the local ministers, whose ordination is in question, is any bishop of the Church.

1. It might have been asserted, as we indeed believe, that our way is the best way. Some teachers in the

Church hold that the ministry is an institution; that is, an established arrangement which may be changed, if it is desired, to suit changing conditions, or developed to keep pace with the growth of man, and which is to be judged by its efficiency. These teachers quote from Holy Scripture the sanction which was applied in the case of certain actions of the Church in the apostolic age, when men said, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost—and to us," to thus order matters and thus, accordingly, have we ordered them. They hold that any change which to-day might seem good to the Holy Ghost and to us, which we, the living Church, might deem fit to make, even in the ministry, would be a valid action. All departures from the original way, whether papal or presbyterian, are to be approved or condemned according to their practical working. The Episcopal manner of ministerial appointment is accounted by these thinkers to be better than any other, simply because it is better. Its recommendation is found in its efficiency. But concerning this, the Episcopal Church, in her authoritative documents, says nothing.

2. It might have been asserted in our formularies that our way is the only way. Some teachers in the Church hold that the ministry is not an institution but a succession; that is, that the Church is like a close corporation which depends for its existence upon an unbroken continuity. A violation of the rules governing the appointment of men into this corporation would invalidate their standing. Thus, if ordination by a bishop were the ancient and regular method of appointment of the officers of an ecclesiastical corpor-

ation, then a failure in that respect would make a man no officer at all. In order to be a valid minister one must be commissioned by a bishop whose authority can be traced back step by step to that day when twelve disciples became twelve apostles. Concerning this theory of the ministry, however, the Episcopal Church is silent. The various religious denominations of the country are dignified in the preface to the Prayer Book by the name of "churches." It is indeed affirmed in the preface to the Ordinal that in "this church" none shall minister unless he has had episcopal ordination. But nothing is affirmed or denied as to ministries which from our point of view are irregular.

3. No; the Episcopal Church, in organization as in doctrine, keeps wisely clear of theories and is blessedly content with facts. The bishops at Chicago and at Lambeth spoke of the "historic episcopate." That phrase has room enough in it for all varieties of opinion. It is the assertion of a fact. There is such a form of ecclesiastical government, which exists to-day and has existed from the beginning of the Christian Church, as the historic episcopate. There is an institutional theory about it, which they may hold who will. There is also a successional theory about it, which they may hold who will. Each of these theories can quote texts out of the Bible and out of the Prayer Book. But neither the doctrine of apostolic evolution nor the doctrine of apostolic succession is set forth by authority. The Church, instead of asserting that our way is either the best way or the only way, is content to affirm the simple fact, easily tested by history, that our way is the old way.

The Congregational way was introduced into the Christian Church by the Rev. Robert Browne, who in the seventeenth century was rector of an English parish.

The Presbyterian way was introduced partly by Luther, partly by Calvin, in the sixteenth century.

The Roman way grew up, in the natural course of events, in the eighth and ninth centuries. Briefly thus. In the first centuries there were many bishops but no pope. That text about the "rock" was understood by most of the early Christian teachers to refer to the confession which Peter had just made, rather than to Peter himself. But even supposing it to have had a personal reference, Peter was the rock on which the Church was founded, only as a missionary to-day in a new country, preaching the gospel for the first time, is similarly the rock on which the Church is founded there. That fact gives the missionary no mortgage on the future. As for the other text about the "keys," Christ gave the keys to the kingdom of heaven—that is, the Church—to St. Peter, and Peter used the keys, one of them on the Day of Pentecost when he opened the door to the Jews, and the other that day in the house of Cornelius when he opened the door to the Gentiles. The doors of the kingdom of heaven have stayed open ever since. Keys are of no more use after the doors are permanently open. The successors of St. Peter have no more monopoly of those old keys than the heirs of Columbus, as one says, have a monopoly of discovering America. The Church, accordingly, began without any pope. It lived and prospered for several hundreds of years without any pope.

Presently, however, for the better governing of the Church, the bishops gathered themselves together into assemblies for consultation, whose president was called patriarch or pope. Gradually the office came to be a permanent one, and to belong by custom to the bishops of five great cities, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Rome and Constantinople. Thus there were five popes. Then came the time when the Mohammedans, advancing from the East, broke down the power of the popes in all the four patriarchates which lay in their path. The Church in the East was laid in ruins. There was only one strong pope remaining, and he lived in Rome. Little by little the power of the bishop of Rome grew greater. Little by little, through his wealth, his position, his natural authority, his ambition, he became master of his brother bishops. That was probably the best thing that could possibly have happened. That strong central government carried the Church through the turmoils of the Middle Ages. In the inevitable course of events, the Church in England acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman bishop. Then came despotism. The new power was abused. The old, was proved to be, after all, the better. So there was revolt. First the Greek nations of the East, and then the Teutonic nations of the North, refused to submit any longer to this usurped domination. The bishops whose predecessors had once known no pope, declined any longer to recognize the pope. The Church in England was foremost in her declaration of independence. Founded before the pope was ever thought of, she returned to the customs of her fathers.

The Church in England, then, began in the days of Henry VIII. only as the life of a man begins when he recovers from a serious sickness. It began over again by a return to its old health. For five hundred years, out of the eighteen hundred of its history, the Church of England lay sick with the Roman fever. Then it recovered. The name of that recovery, in ecclesiastical annals, is the Reformation. The Episcopal Church in this country is the daughter of the Church of England.

The papacy, after all, was not a breaking down of the episcopal and primitive method of ordering the ministry. It was only a temporary addition to it. This addition was rejected. Without a break the ancient church went on. The Episcopal Church today looks back, through all the ages of her uninterrupted history, not only to the time when there was not a Presbyterian and not a Congregationalist on the face of the earth, but to the time when even in old Rome there was not a Romanist, because the only church in that ancient city of the saints and martyrs was the Episcopal Church.

§ 3. But what is the good of it? What is the value of this historic fact that the ministry of the Episcopal Church is appointed in the old way, and that its annals go back without a break to the beginning? Of what benefit is it to be a part of the ancient and historic society of the apostles? Surely, the most important part of religion is not in its form but its spirit, not the apostles' fellowship but the apostles' doctrine. The great question about a church and its ministry is not the regularity of its ordination but the richness of

its life and the vigor of its work. It is of vastly more importance to be a good Christian than a good churchman. Christ first, always; and then, a long way after, the Church! What is the real value of our ministerial position?

It is the charter of our religious liberty.

There is always this difficulty about any organization, that it tends to hinder growth. At first the pot protects the plant, but presently the plant gets too big for the pot; if the plant is to grow, the pot must be broken. Truth has a habit of outgrowing the formulas in which the fathers clothed it. The living Church, passing out of childhood into youth and thence into maturity, needs to be all the time putting away childish things; gets beyond the old, petty regulations, into new responsibilities and new opportunities and larger life. But time and use make words and customs to be held sacred. The ancient formula, the ancient regulation, which once voiced the truth as men were able to understand it, and ministered once to spiritual necessities, are accounted precious for their own sake. The pot is valued even above the plant. Every reformer has to break the flower-pot for the sake of the flowers.

Accordingly, the ideal organization is one that is itself alive, and thus able to grow even as the living truth grows, and the living Church. Where shall we find it? What will be the characteristics of the ideal organization?

Evidently, its distinguishing note will not be theological orthodoxy. It will not present an elaborate and final statement of Christian doctrine, from which there can be no deviation. For that means the fet-

tering of thought, the abolition of intellectual independence. The present is made not only the pupil but the slave of the past. "It is written," "It is written," is set upon the title-page of all the theologies and all the commentaries, and at the head of all the sermons, and over the doors of all the seminaries. The only right that men are to have to-day is the right of quotation from the fathers. The ghosts of the old dead doctors blindfold the living Church. Let not the plant dare to outgrow the pot!

Not in this direction are we to look for the union which means liberty also.

Nor will the distinguishing note of the ideal organization be ecclesiastical tyranny. It will not give into the hands of any man the intellect, the will, the conscience, of the Church. No potentate shall send a letter over the sea to tell us how to think.

It is no wonder that people have been attracted by these two kinds of organization. Either of them at its best would be good enough for the millennium. A Confession of Faith, every word of which should be infallibly and divinely true—who would ask anything better than that? A pope who should be possessed of absolute sanctity and absolute wisdom—who would not hasten to obey him? But the trouble is that the pope is only a man, who may be good or bad, who may be wise or foolish; and the Confession was written by men whose only advantage over the men of the present is the enchantment of distance. They lived several hundred years ago; they were no more infallible than we are. The Confession has not yet been written, nor has the pope yet lived, to whose words we may commit

the guidance of our thinking and our living. Nor is there any prospect, human nature being what it is, that the growing plant of Christian truth can find the room it needs in either of these pots.

The ideal organization, in the judgment of the Episcopal Church, has for its distinguishing note a living line of living men. The Church is thus a family, and the one link which binds its members together is the fact of membership in the family. Naturally, the old customs of the family are regarded with affection. There is a family spirit and loyalty which ministers in the best way to conservatism. Yet with this goes the widest liberty. The members of the family do not all look alike, nor dress alike, nor live alike, nor think alike. There is no individual in the family who has authority to command the others. The one bond of union is membership in the living family.

Accordingly, in the Episcopal Church, there are the widest differences. Here is simplicity, there is elaboration, in the service. Here the teaching is almost synonymous with Calvinism ; there, with Romanism ; and there, again, with Arianism. Men in cassocks and men in cut-away coats meet in our clerical gatherings. To say that a person is a minister of the Episcopal Church throws but the faintest light upon his theological or his ecclesiastical position. In no other Christian communion is there such room for variation, for individuality, for independent thinking, for religious liberty.

And this is due to the fact that that which holds us together is not our common acceptance of a book of theology, and not our common allegiance to an omnipotent ecclesiastic, but our relation to a living line of living men, to the bishops of the historic episcopate.

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH.

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH.

Let all things be done decently and in order.—1 Cor. xiv. 40.

§ 1. To get that accomplished is the purpose of the discipline of the Church. The word *discipline* is used in this connection in its technical sense, to mean "regulation," and especially such regulation as is not more directly included under the head of doctrine or of worship. In general, it signifies the provision which the Church has made to secure the decent and orderly living of its life.

The topics which might be considered under such a wide subject are, of course, many and various. There must be a selection made. The three that I have chosen have been taken in preference to others, not only on account of their interest and importance, but by reason of their connection with certain wide spread misconceptions of the position of the Episcopal Church. Thus, it is believed by some that the ecclesiastical constitution of the Episcopal Church is out of harmony with the spirit of a republican country, that it suits better with monarchy. Some, again, account the Church to be unfraternally exclusive, and to hold herself aloof in an unchristian way from other religious communions. While still others, taking up still another kind of criticism, consider the Church to be given over to worldliness.

I purpose, then, to consider first the arrangement of ecclesiastical government in the Episcopal Church ; and then the attitude of the Episcopal Church toward the ministers and members of other Christian communions; and finally, the relation of the Christian to the world, as it is taught in the Episcopal Church.

§ 2. I will begin with the constitution of the Church ; that is, with the provisions that are made in it for orderly government.

There are two great systems of legislation that are in use to-day among the nations of the earth. They differ in their theories about the source of power, whether it comes down from above or up from below, whether power belongs to the prince or to the people. These two great methods of government have well been named from their most notable representatives, one in ancient and one in modern times, the Roman and the English.

The Roman idea of government emphasizes centralization ; one man must be supreme and all other men his ministers and message-takers : all law, in its final analysis, is the expression of this man's will ; the people are his servants. The English idea of government emphasizes the distribution of power ; the people are supreme and the rulers are their servants ; law is the voice of the majority ; all authority, no matter who it is that holds it, is but a delegated authority, which the people, for their own interests, have given and may take away again ; the men in the offices of government simply represent the people.

These two great methods of legislation met for the first time when our barbarian ancestors stormed the

Roman Empire. Government by centralization was defeated. From that day, government by representation has held the keys of the future.

When the political arrangements of the United States of America were made, a hundred years ago, government by representation was set as the ideal of our republican institutions. Just at the same time, and by very nearly the same men, the ecclesiastical arrangements of the Episcopal Church were put in order. Two-thirds of the members of the convention which formed the Consititution of the United States, including such men of note and influence as Alexander Hamilton, and Benjamin Franklin, and Robert Morris, and George Washington, were connected with the Episcopal Church. The first Bishop of Pennsylvania was chaplain of the Continental Congress. It was but natural that the ecclesiastical organization of the Church and the political organization of the State should have been constructed along the same lines. Indeed, the likenesses are both many and remarkable. Especially, the spirit of free and independent representative government is alike the spirit of them both.

This will be best illustrated by an outline of the organization of the Church.

The people of the Church are gathered into parishes; or into mission stations, which are to parishes what boroughs are to towns. Every year the people have the power of choosing their representatives in open election. These representatives form the vestry. The vestry act for the congregation. They have entire control of all the temporal affairs of the parish. They

also call the rector, who has in his hands the entire conduct of the spiritual interests of the parish.

The parishes of the Church are joined within district boundaries into dioceses. As the parish corresponds to the town, so the diocese corresponds to the state. Every parish sends representatives to an annual diocesan convention. One of the representatives is the clergyman of the parish, the others are laymen chosen by the vestry. These clergymen and laymen, representing both the spiritual and the temporal interests of all the people of the diocese, consult together concerning diocesan matters and make laws for diocesan regulation. These representatives of the people choose and call the bishop, who is the general superintendent of the work of the Church in the diocese.

All the dioceses of the country are included in the National Church, and are represented in the General Convention. The General Convention is held once every three years. The dioceses are represented by their bishops and by certain clergymen and laymen elected at the diocesan conventions. These representatives are divided into two houses, one being the House of Bishops, (corresponding, except in tenure of office, with the United States Senate,) and the other the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, (corresponding to the House of Representatives). This General Convention, limited by the written constitution of the Church, legislates for the entire Episcopal Church in this country. No measure, however, can become a legal enactment of the Church without the consent of both houses, nor can any measure of constitutional

importance be finally adopted without being referred back to the whole Church, in its diocesan conventions and its parochial vestry-meetings, and being a second time approved three years after, by the next General Convention.

In one respect the Church is further removed from even the appearance of monarchy than the state is, for we have no Chief Executive. There is, indeed, a Presiding Bishop, but he has no administrative power. No bishop has authority over any other bishop. No man of any rank whatever, has the power of veto in this Church.

It is true that there are two important differences between the administration of the Church and of the country. One is, that while the people have their part in the call to the ministry, and in the choice of the particular minister for the particular parish, the spiritual commission and authority come from above. No man is made a minister in this Church by the vote of the people alone, (though he cannot be ordained without the recommendation of a vestry,) or by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery alone, (though there must be presbyters to join with the bishop); a bishop must ordain him. This, however, agrees with the history of the beginning of all Christian ecclesiastical authority. It came from Christ to the apostles, and from the apostles to the elders whom they ordained in every city.

The other difference is that the spiritual officers of the Church, the bishops and the clergy, hold their offices not subject to removal by the people; thus avoiding the danger of democratic government, the

great temptation to listen to the voice of the majority in preference to the voice of conscientious duty.

Nevertheless, the Church shares equally with the State in the spirit of free, popular, independent and representative government. One of the worst mistakes that the Church ever made was in her old, ill-fated alliance with the English Crown in the days of the Stuarts. Episcopacy and monarchy, men were falsely taught, must stand or fall together. It is out of this old blunder that most of this misconception of the spirit of the Church has sprung. It is no wonder. But in the providence of God, we have been able in this country to remedy that error, and to set the Church where she belongs, on the side of freedom, of progress, and of the people.

§ 3. I come now to consider the attitude of the Episcopal Church toward the ministers and members of other Christian communions.

1. The position of the Church with regard to other Christian ministers is set forth in these words in the preface to the Ordinal: "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he—hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.

This appears to be a way of saying that other ministers are no ministers at all. Instead of that, however, an attentive reading of the words will show that all that is said is that ministers who are not episcopally ordained are not Episcopal ministers. They are not ministers, the Church says, in "this" Church; that is,

in the Episcopal Church. Surely, thus far, there is nothing unrighteously exclusive.

However, this position does undeniably work in an exclusive way. It interrupts certain fraternal courtesies. It prevents the interchange of sermons and of some other ministerial offices. It does, undeniably, set the clergy of all the Episcopal Church on one side and the clergy of all the other Protestant churches on the other side. It is an assertion of difference.

The truth is, there is a difference.

This difference is not in spiritual attainments. We are willing here to set the ministries of other Christian churches in advance of ours. The difference is not in abundance of the blessings of God. God blesses all good work everywhere, and many other communions can count up spiritual harvests equal to ours, and some of them far greater. The difference, indeed, does not touch the deepest matters of the Christian religion at all. It has nothing to do with faith. It has nothing to do with eternal salvation. It is concerned with the practical work of the Christian Church here in the world. It is an assertion of what we consider a great misfortune in the present condition of Christendom, and is our way of protesting against it. It is a setting forth of what seems to us the best way out.

To a good many people this which we consider a fault in our common Christianity that ought to be remedied is no fault at all. To a great many more people the remedy which we propose is no kind of remedy. The fault is Christian division. The remedy is union by the historic episcopate.

The point of view from which we look at this matter is briefly this. We believe that Jesus Christ founded the Church, that he founded one church, and that when he desired in his prayer in the Upper Room that all Christians might be one, he meant exactly what he said, and in the completest signification of the words—one spirit and one body. We believe that the one society which Jesus Christ founded has come down through all the centuries, and is discoverable in the world to-day: and that the principal of continuance, of unbroken life, in it, has been a long line, not of doctrines but of men. The Christian society has lived, as every other society lives, in the regular and orderly appointment of its officers. And the phrase by which we express that unbroken orderly appointment is "the historic episcopate."

Now, looking back along the history of this apostolic society, we note continual separations from it. For good cause and for bad, men have departed on one side or the other, some objecting to the Church's doctrine, some to the Church's discipline; and these men have founded voluntary societies of their own. Some of these associations have grown great and lasted long, but they have all shown elements of weakness which have first broken them up into divisions and sub-divisions, and have finally led to their disappearance or their absorption again into the Church. Only the Church, held together by the strong chain of the historic episcopate, has continued on. All along, the voluntary societies have stood for division and have perished: the Church has stood for unity and permanence.

It is not to be denied that men have had good reason time and again, for departing from the apostolic society. Whoever must choose between the Church and the truth ought not to be long in doubt. The Church has been at fault, and flagrantly at fault. The preservation of the historical episcopate has not prevented the promulgation of false doctrine. And the unity which has gone along with it, has more than once been interpreted into a uniformity which has forced good men into rebellion. It was, for example, our own fault that the Presbyterians went out from us and founded their new society, in the seventeenth century. It was our own fault that the Methodists went out from us and founded their new society in the eighteenth century. It is possible, that if the Church had then been more wise and more Christian, all the Presbyterians and all the Methodists, and all the Congregationalists and all the Baptists, would still be where they once were—in the Episcopal Church.

For the Episcopal Church is different from all the other Christian bodies of the Protestant world in this: That she is older than any of the others ; yes, that her history goes back, unbroken, step by step, through many dangers, many vicissitudes, many blunders, and many glorious victories, too, to the day of the apostles. Alone of all the Protestant communions, the Episcopal Church represents, and is, the original society which Jesus Christ himself established in this world. This assertion depends not on any theory but upon historic fact. The chain which we take hold of, that reaches back into the past to the very beginning, is

the living chain of a regularly appointed, that is, an episcopally appointed, ministry.

Now we want the Church of Christ to be one again. We want an end to all this hampering, hindering, unbrotherly and unchristian division. And we believe that the one institution which offers a way and a promise of future union is the historic episcopate. We believe that the ancient Church, which has outlived all the divisions of the past, will outlive all the divisions of the present. In our way of looking at it, the apostolic society stands for unity. And, accordingly, in proportion for our desire for unity, we emphasize the difference between the apostolic society and all other Christian societies, and we assert the difference between a ministry derived by regular commission through the historic episcopate and any other ministry appointed in any other way.

We may be mistaken. It may prove that the new union of Christendom for which we look will break with the past altogether. The difference upon which we lay stress between an Episcopal minister and any other minister may be a foolish and unimportant difference. Still this is what we honestly believe. This is the lesson which we draw from the teachings of the past. And we maintain our position by asserting in our formularies and carrying out in our practice the statement that no man is to be accounted a lawful minister in *this* Church except he has been episcopally ordained.

2. The position of the Episcopal Church with regard to the members of other Christian bodies is sometimes thought to be stated in a most exclusive way

in the rubric at the end of the Order of Confirmation: "There shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed."

It is true that the Episcopal Church does not admit members of other Christian churches by letter of transfer alone. This procedure is in no way an aspersion upon their Christian standing. It does not mean that they have never really been good Christians before, and that they must now begin all over again. In no other Christian body does a letter of transfer by itself confer a right to the Communion. There must be some formal admission. In the Episcopal Church we emphasize as such form of admission the rite of the laying on of hands. We think that we read of this laying on of hands in the New Testament. We find that both in Samaria and in Ephesus people who had been baptized had apostolic hands laid upon their heads, and that this, at least in those instances, was considered as the intermediate step between baptism and the Lord's Supper. And we are reinforced in our interpretation by the universal and continuous practice of the Christian Church. For centuries it was everywhere understood that before entrance to Holy Communion must come the laying on of hands.

Accordingly, when people come to us from other communions, never having received after their baptism this laying on of hands, we tell them these things, and advise them to present themselves before the bishop.

This regulation, however, was not intended to teach any unfraternal doctrine of "close communion." It is not likely that the rubric was meant to touch the

conduct of adult Christians at all. It was framed to meet the conditions of a church which believes in the baptism of infants. Baptism, even in infancy, is accounted to be an admission into the membership of the Church. But the full privileges of the Christian communion are reserved for matured and instructed persons who shall have evidenced their fitness for these blessings by an open confession of allegiance. It is a matter of evident necessity that some provision be made that none shall venture into these reserved privileges until he be of a prepared heart and of an understanding mind. The purpose of this rubric is to make this necessary provision. And that is all the purpose there is in it.

The invitation to the Communion Service ought to make that plain enough: "Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life —draw near with faith and take this holy sacrament to your comfort." All in the Church who are touched by that wide invitation, all Christians who love the Lord Jesus Christ, no matter to what ecclesiastical organization they may happen to belong, are invited, are urged, to remain and unite with us in this our common Christian service of love and adoration.

§ 4. The third matter which I set myself to consider is the relation which is thought right in the Episcopal Church between the Christian and the world. What may a Christian do, and what must a Christian refrain from doing, in society?

At first it would seem as if the Episcopal Church were provided with no answer to this question. Un-

less such an answer were to be found in the promise which every communicant of the Church has made in the presence of God and of the congregation, "to renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanity of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh." This, however, is stated in such general terms, and the interpretation of it is left so entirely to the individual Christian, that to many people it seems to provide no sort of sufficient regulation.

True it is, that we have no list of forbidden amusements. Not one of the pleasures of society is singled out and interdicted to any of our members. Nobody who comes into the communion of this Church is ever made to promise explicitly not to dance, nor to play cards, nor to attend the theatre. As a matter of fact, members of the Episcopal Church engage in all these amusements without a thought of excommunication. Is it not true, then, that the Episcopal Church is open to a charge of worldliness?

It would be easy to reply by use of the argument *Tu quoque.* Thou also, art thou free from every stain of secularity? Let the innocent throw stones. No doubt but that there are a great many worldly people in the Episcopal Church. I wish there were no worldly people outside of it. But I am afraid that that claim cannot be made. I fear that the Episcopal Church has no monopoly of worldliness. All good Christians, in this Church and out of it, try to keep unspotted from the world, but the ideal is still distant from the real, even in the lives of the saints. We all need to be on guard against the sin of secularity.

May we not, however, sometimes mistake that for worldliness which is not worldliness at all?

Worldliness, we need to remember, does not consist in outward behavior but in the thoughts of the heart. Our Lord himself was accused of worldliness by the Pharisees, because he ate and drank like other people. And that mistake is forever being made. To-day people are commonly accounted worldly who are often seen, attired in handsome dress, in ballrooms and in the boxes of theatres. That is our standard. In the Middle Ages, among the strict, they were accounted worldly who washed themselves more frequently than once a month. That was their standard. The truth is, however, that worldliness cannot be accurately defined in terms of behavior. It is not limited to any occupation, to any place, to any presence or absence of wealth and luxury, nor to any class of society. It is a disposition of the heart. The people in the parlor are not all of them worldly, any more than the people in the Church are all of them unworldly. Many a pious critic is as much mistaken as the old scribes. God, who sees the heart, knows who the worldly people are. We can only guess at it. No doubt we many times guess wrong.

But in the presence of unmistakable worldliness, what shall we do? There is danger of secularity, the pomps and vanities assail us with temptations. What ought the Christian Church to do for the guiding and guarding of the Christians?

The Church may put forth either rules or principles. That is, the Church may act either as the substitute for the individual conscience, and do our thinking for

us; or the Church may be the awakener and the quickener of the individual conscience, leaving us to make our own decisions. The Episcopal Church prefers to emphasize great principles, desires to leave us free to think.

There is a wisdom which results from age and long experience. After many false starts and foolish notions, and flat failures, it is learned that wisdom dwells with prudence. The young spiritual husbandman sets out with enthusiastic diligence to root up all the tares. It is only after making a good trial of his own judgment that he assures himself that Christ's judgment is a great deal better. Let the tares and the wheat grow together until the harvest: then God will weed the garden of the Church.

Almost every new religious sect starts out on a crusade to extirpate the tares; yes, and whatever even looks like tares. The good people make all manner of strict rules. Nobody can stay in their company who does this or that. They begin the erection of a high wall between themselves and the bad world. But somehow, high though the wall may be, doorless and windowless, and with broken glass along the top, the devil always manages to make his quick way over. By and by it is discovered that Christ knew best. Let us fight against sin, not so much by the laying down of rules as by the inculcation of a Christian spirit. Especially, let us not take everything for tares that looks like tares. Let us not confuse our consciences by inventing any new sins. There are quite enough real sins in this wicked world already. The Episcopal Church learned that lesson many centuries ago.

One of the reasons why Jesus declined to give rules like the scribes, but set great principles in the place of them, was because he wanted his disciples to use their own judgment. When the two brothers came to the Master to ask him to settle between them their disputed inheritance, he declined to enter into any of the details of their misunderstanding. He helped them, indeed; but it was not by counting their money for them, not by measuring their land, not by any computation of values nor interpretation of the will. He laid down a deep and eternal principle which they might apply to their own case for themselves.

The Episcopal Church believes that that is still the best way of guiding people out of their difficulties, and of answering their cases of conscience. All solutions are but temporary and need revision when the problem solved is one that involves things local and changing. But principles are of universal application.

May I do this? May I go here or there? Is this or that forbidden? The Episcopal Church returns an answer that was true yesterday, and is true to-day, and will be true forever. You are to follow the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to do only what you think he would approve of, and not to do anything that you think he would not approve of. And you are to apply his example and his instruction to your own life yourself, using your own conscience, making your own decisions. You are to love him and to serve him. Whoever gives his heart to Christ, will not give it to the world.

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH.

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH.

Golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints. Rev. v. 8.

§ 1. The prayers of the saints are part form and part spirit. There is utterance and there is aspiration. The golden bowls are full of incense.

The difference between the prayers of the saints and the prayers of indifferent and irreligious people is not a difference in form so much as in spirit. The utterance may be alike in both cases. The saintly person and the unsaintly person may kneel side by side, and recite the same sentences of devotion. The difference is in the hidden aspiration of the heart. Every worshipper in the congregation has a golden bowl. But the golden bowls of some of the worshippers are empty: the golden bowls of other worshippers are filled with foolish, unworthy and unseemly things. The golden bowls of the saints are full of incense.

All public worship, even the plainest, has in it the element of form. The moment a word is spoken there begins a form of prayer. The only way to have a service without a use of form would be to have it in unbroken silence. All Christian people, even the Society of Friends, agree in the use of some kind of form.

What we are all desirous to avoid is not form but

formalism. Formalism is the use of empty form. It is the utterance of the words of prayer without the aspiration of prayer. It is the hearing of petition with the ear, while the thoughts are away outside the church and quite apart from devotion. It is the uplifting of bowls empty of incense.

Formalism does not depend upon the form which is provided for the use of the worshippers. There is no possible arrangement of the service that can keep formalism out. It depends upon the individual Christian.

It is true that an elaborate service must always and of necessity be entered into with a certain amount of formalism by a stranger. The stranger is obliged to occupy some of the time of service in finding the places, and in trying to understand what is being done, and in wondering what is going to be done next. His thoughts are, in a measure, diverted from his prayers. Whatever he says or does while he is thus preoccupied is said or done formally. But the stranger would be very much mistaken, who, finding this element of formalism in his own unaccustomed use of the service, should think that everybody else in the congregation is equally a formalist, and that the service itself is but an empty form. The formalism is all his own.

The service may be simple or it may be elaborate, it may be extemporaneous or it may be read out of a book, the petition may be a "long prayer," or a litany—the formalism of it depends largely upon the worshipper. Wherever any single person is not intent with his whole heart upon every single word, there is formalism.

It is true that the greater the length and the more complicated the conduct of the service, the wider opportunity is there for formal worship. And the more words that are set for the worshipper to say, the more danger is there that he will say some of them with his lips rather than with his heart. It is equally true, however, that the man who had ten talents had more of his master's money to squander, if he chose, than the man who had but one. But he had also more to use, if he would, for his master's service. Opportunity and responsibility always go together. Yet we do not decline our opportunities. We know that much will be required of those who have much; nevertheless we desire to have all that we can get. How much pain might be avoided by living all alone in a cave and never entering into any of the relationships or the friendships of life! Every new affection is a new avenue for grief to get into the soul. But we want our lives to be filled with affection. No doubt also, but a good deal of the danger of formalism might be avoided by having the simplest service possible. Indeed we might escape formalism altogether by never saying our prayers at all. But the more there is in the service so much the more is it freighted with possible blessings, so much the more may we get out of it into our life.

We have, no doubt, a great deal of formalism in the Episcopal Church. We are all formalists at times, to our great shame. And some of this formalism is very likely due to the beauty and the richness of our service, and to the very high spiritual standard that is set in it. But that is our fault. The best thing to

do is not to bring the standard down to our own lower level of living, but to try to live closer and to think and pray nearer to that high ideal. Formalism grows out of lack of zeal and lack of love. And I am afraid that we must all of us, in the Episcopal Church and out of it, plead guilty without much distinction of denomination. Where is the Christian whose golden bowl is always full of incense?

The golden bowl is the symbol of worship. The Episcopal Church emphasizes the idea of worship.

There are two reasons for going to church which ought to have their place in the purpose of every Christian. We ought to go partly for the praying and partly for the preaching. We ought to go thinking of God, and of our own souls. It should be our purpose, on the one hand, to make an offering to God, the offering of our adoration, of our praise and prayer, of our renewed consecration of ourselves to him. It should also be our purpose, on the other hand, to bring away a blessing from God, a blessing upon our own souls. We desire to learn the will of God, to get the help of God.

Both of these reasons for church-going are fully recognized in the Episcopal Church. The service is not a preaching service only, nor a praying and praising service only : it is both together. The emphasis, indeed, is rather upon the side of worship than upon the side of instruction. Our thoughts are directed even more toward God than toward ourselves.

The worship of the Episcopal Church is set in order in the Book of Common Prayer.

§ 2. There are two grounds upon which this most

distinctive feature of the Church may be commended. One is the argument for antiquity: the other is the argument from excellence.

1. The use of a book of prayer is older than the Christian era; it goes back into the days of the earlier dispensation. Our Lord and his apostles, who attended the services of the temple and the synagogue, used the prayers which were there read out of the appointed books. Jesus himself not only gave a form of prayer which his disciples might make a part and pattern of their devotions, but he chose the phrases of it, for the most part, from the familiar sentences of the Jewish prayer book. When we take part in a Prayer Book service to-day, we use a way of worship that was used by Christ himself.

Nor is this true merely in the reading of the prayers out of a book. The essential arrangement of the service is still the same as that in which the Master joined. Naturally, the Christian disciples in arranging the service of the Christian society would follow the order to which they had been accustomed all their lives. They would take that old synagogue service and make it Christian. To this we probably owe the great use of the psalms in the Prayer Book. From this, it is likely, we derive that three-fold division of the daily service into penitence and praise and prayer, which still remains. The synagogue service of our Lord's Day began with a penitential preface, and then came praise expressed in the jubilant voices of the psalms, and after that followed prayer.

The Prayer Book which we use in the Episcopal Church has its root in that old service of the syna-

gogue. And it has grown out of that, as a tree grows, into what we have to-day. No man ever in all history —no, nor any company of men—sat down and composed this book. It was not written in the sixteenth century, nor in the sixth. It has grown from the beginning with the growth of the Christian Church.

Thus the Prayer Book was, first of all, in Hebrew. It was a Jewish book. The order of daily morning and evening prayer was according to the custom of the synagogue. Instead of a service for the Holy Communion it had a service for the Feast of the Passover. Instead of a form for Baptism it had a form for circumcision. The place which is now taken in it by the holy days of the Christian year was taken then by the holy days of the Jewish year. Christ and his apostles used it.

Then the Prayer Book was translated into Greek. That was the common language of all the Eastern world in which the Church began. Christian sacraments took the place of the ancient rites, ceremonies, and sacrifices. The order for the Holy Communion, even so far back as that, in the earliest centuries, corresponded in all essential points, and in many words and paragraphs, with the service as we have it now. The old Hebrew book was Christianized. As the Church grew, the Prayer Book was enriched and elaborated. The Prayer of St. Chrysostom, to take only one illustration, was brought at that time into the book.

Presently, the balance of strength passed from the East, where the Church began, into the West, which had long been missionary ground. The Prayer Book was translated into Latin. The substance of the Greek

book was still kept, but the process of enrichment and elaboration continued. The purpose of the Church was to meet in this book all the spiritual needs of man, and these needs the Church kept learning more and more. Thus the Prayer Book, at heart the same, continually, little by little, changed and grew. The book reflected the whole life of the Church. By and by when false doctrine began to creep into the Christian society, it showed itself inevitably in the book. The Prayer Book was Romanized.

At last there came another change in the balance of power among the nations of the earth. The sceptre which had passed from the Greeks to the Latins, passed now from the Latins to that race which holds the destinies of the future, the Anglo-Saxon. The Reformation was one of the upheavals which accompanied that change. The Prayer Book was now translated out of Latin into English. In this translation the false doctrine and misleading ceremonies were taken out. The service was simplified, and purified, and otherwise adapted to the new knowledge which the Church had gained of human nature and of its spiritual needs. And nothing else was done. The translation into English did not create a new Prayer Book, any more than a translation of Homer makes a new Homer. That ancient book, which has been held in the praying hands of the Christian Church from the day in which there began to be a Christian Church, which has shared in all the vicissitudes and all the victories of Christian history, which has voiced the prayer of the missionary in those deep forests which ages ago gave place to the cities of Paris and

London and Berlin, and the cry of the martyr even in old pagan Rome, and the joy of the hero in the moment of his triumph, and the exultation of the discoverer when he set his feet on this new land, the book of the knights and of the monks, the book of the popes and of the reformers, the book of all the saints of old, that book is to-day the possession of the Episcopal Church.

Surely, this venerable volume is entitled to respect. It is not lightly to be set aside. It is not probable that any company of wise men, out of their own heads, will write a modern book which will put this heirloom of all the Christian past into obscurity. Indeed, the book is as new as it is old. Even to-day the Church is still keeping it, as she has always done, close to contemporary life. This very year at the General Convention of the Episcopal Church, this book of the past, which is just as much the book of the present, will be given a new date, marking its latest growth, the date of 1892.

2. But the argument from antiquity is not the most convincing argument. The most persuasive kind of reasoning to-day is that which is based on the solid foundation of actual excellence. We have no great reverence in these days for things that are old simply because they are old. We are inclined to believe that the new is better. We have improved upon our fathers. Indeed, is it not true that the young men are older than the old men, because they have had the benefit of a whole generation more of human experience?

We are practical people, little given to sentiment.

We do not care very much where things came from, no matter how far back in the past, but whether they can do their work. We are on the watch, not for the oldest but for the best. We are ready to put away any, even the most venerable, institution that we have, if we are assured that we can get something more serviceable, something really better, in the place of it. We insist upon testing all things to-day, not by their age, but by their excellence.

Accordingly we lay most emphasis upon the real spiritual advantages that attend the Church's manner of worship.

One advantage is the securing of reverence. Another is the maintaining of truth.

(1.) The Prayer Book helps to make the Church's worship more reverent. It is necessary for the securing of reverence that the service should be taken in a large measure out of the ordering of the minister. All ministers, unhappily, are not men of profound spiritual gifts.

We must take men, however, not as we wish they were, but as they are. And as they are, with all their imperfections, shallownesses, prejudices, low ideals, and halting attainment even of low ideals, sometimes in the spirit and sometimes out of the spirit, we account it better that the service of our worship should be lifted effectually above the littlenesses of men, above the fluctuations of spiritual heat and cold in the human heart, out of dependence on the weather or the size of the congregation or the health of the officiating minister, and made permanently reverent, worthy, uplifting, religious. Let us make sure, at least, of the golden bowl.

2. Nor is it enough to have a golden bowl. We want a bowl that is large enough. We want a bowl that is round, that bears in its shape the circle of completeness and of comprehension. We desire not only reverence but truth.

Not all ministers, unfortunately, are men of wide experience of the spiritual needs of human nature, nor of deep acquaintance with all the phases of religious truth. The chances are, that, if the service is left to the individual minister, some spiritual necessity will go unheeded, some prayer will be without a voice. All men, indeed, even with the best intentions and with the largest advantages, are one-sided; that is, they naturally look at truth more from one point of view than from another.

It is natural and probably inevitable, that men should dwell most upon those truths which most appeal to them. With all the helps that are provided in the Prayer Book, there is a constant temptation to teach religious truth unequally. Without a Prayer Book the temptation meets with little hindrance. Some ministers will teach that God is our Father and say little about God as our Judge; some will emphasize the first and great commandment so as to obscure that second commandment which is like unto it; some will dwell far more upon the doctrine of the incarnation than upon the doctrine of the atonement. Every religious teacher knows how difficult it is rightly to divide the word of truth and to preach the whole gospel of God. But here the Prayer Book is a constant guide and inspiration. Week by week, as the Christian seasons pass, the Church herself, in the

Prayer Book, whether the minister wishes it or not, sets forth the great round of Christian truth. Not one essential or helpful article of faith can be left out.

The Prayer Book service secures reverence and maintains truth, not only by taking the worship of the Church out of the exclusive ordering of the minister, but by putting a considerable part of it into the lips of the people. Religion has always suffered, has always fallen into superstition and falsehood, when it has been allowed to become a monopoly of the parsons. The Church needs the good sense of the people. The people, too, have their rights in the Church. The people are the Church. The worship of the sanctuary ought to be the people's worship. In the Prayer Book it is. The Episcopal Church believes in the people. The Prayer Book is the guardian of the people's rights.

3. Concerning the ritual part of the worship of the Church, such as the bowing of the head and the bending of the knee, and the wearing of certain ministerial vestments, these are just such provisions which we might expect to find in the ordering of a service in a Church which has had nearly nineteen centuries of experience in ministering to the needs of human nature.

The Episcopal Church learned long ago, from her mother, the Church of the Old Testament, that men and women, even in service times are not disembodied spirits. We are not all mind nor all soul. We have bodies. And the body influences the mind and the soul. A lounging, careless and irreverent attitude of body not only betokens a similar condition of heart,

but actually causes it. On the other hand, reverence of body helps generally to reverence of spirit.

The purpose of the Church in prescribing these accessories to her worship is a thoroughly practical purpose. We will pray better if we kneel down devoutly when we pray. We will sing our praises better if we stand up when we sing. This is human nature.

As to the wearing of vestments, and the adorning of chancels, and the changing of colors, and the uplifting of altars, and the use of the cross and of other religious symbols, the Prayer Book itself has little or nothing to say. These are but the applications which we make, according to our own preference, our own taste, our own sense of what will help us, of the essential principle which underlies all ritual—the truth that the soul may be ministered to through the body, especially that our eyes are given us to see with, and that we learn with our eyes as well as with our ears. The justification of all these things is not so much their age or their origin, nor so much who has used them nor where they have been used, as their actual fitness, their genuine helpfulness. All things that help are good for the people whom they help. All things that hinder are bad for the people whom they hinder.

That is why the worship of the Episcopal Church differs in different parishes. The words are the same, but here they are said and there they are sung; here there is a great deal of ritual, there but little. The parishes are different; that is why. One parish is helped by emphasis upon the ritual adjuncts of the

service; another is not. Ritual is only a means, never an end : the end which ritual serves, and by which it must be valued, is spiritual help.

Beyond the common acts of kneeling and standing, which have their counterparts in the worship of all Christian people, the Episcopal Church asks nothing else. For example, there is no word in the Prayer Book about bowing at the name of Jesus in the creed. That is left to the individual Christian. The custom is said to have begun in the long-ago days of heresy, when those who held the ancient faith of the Church about the divinity of our Lord desired to emphasize the statement of it. The bowing is not so much a reverence as an affirmation. But some bow and some do not. There is no rule about it in the Episcopal Church.

In general, in regard to the conduct of the individual Christian in the service, that may rightly be done, which, without unduly offending other people, is found by each Christian to be helpful. The Episcopal Church does not forbid anybody to genuflect nor to cross himself, if he gets any real good out of it. People are different. We are slow to recognize that. It is hard for us to realize that any one can be altogether unlike our own selves, and yet be just as acceptable in the sight of God.

The Episcopal Church has room in her worship for the devotion of all the different people in the world. The Roman Catholic, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, even the soldiers of the Salvation Army, can each find fitting spiritual ministration in the Episcopal Church.

Do that which is of help to you; and let your neighbor, without any narrow judging, do that which is of help to him. That is the true spirit of the worship of the Episcopal Church.

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Matt. xxviii. 19.

This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. . . This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you. Luke xxii. 19, 20.

THUS did Christ himself ordain the two sacraments of the Church, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

§ 1. The Episcopal Church sets no emphasis on the mere ritual of baptism. No importance is attached to the quantity of water which is used in that sacrament. Neither is any one particular way of administering the sacrament exclusively prescribed. Those who desire, may be baptized by immersion; those who do not wish to be immersed may be baptized by pouring.

The use of the word "baptism" in the New Testament settles nothing as to the primitive ritual. Sometimes it seems to mean the act of putting wholly under the water; sometimes it seems to mean pouring or affusion. When the Jews in their ceremonial purifications "baptized" the long couches on which they lay at dinner, it is not likely that they submerged them in the water. When the people of Israel were "baptized," as St. Paul says, when they went dry shod through the Red Sea, it is evident that they were not under the water at all. When the disciples in the upper

room on the Day of Pentecost were "baptized," as the Lord had promised, with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the fire touched only their heads. As for the symbolic relation between baptism and burial, that is preserved whichever ritual is used. Burial, so far as the part of the Church in it is concerned, is the pouring of earth three times upon the body; and baptism, in its more usual administration, is the thrice repeated pouring of water.

It is certain that in the earliest baptisms the minister and the person to be baptized went together into the water. It is not certain, however, that the minister then submerged the candidate. The oldest pictures, dating back to the beginning of Christian history, represent the two standing in the water, and the minister pouring water on the disciple's head.

Even if we knew that submersion was the primitive form of baptism, that would not bind us to the use of that especial manner. Ritual is for man, not man for ritual. The purpose of it is to secure orderliness and reverence, and to preserve truth. The judge as to the helpfulness, and the fitness, and the continuance of ritual is the Church.

Accordingly, the Christian Church has altered the primitive ritual of the Lord's Supper. We do not partake of it, as they did in the upper room, reclining. Nor do we insist that the bread used in it shall be unleavened, as that was, nor that the wine shall be mixed with water. We have the same right to change, if we will, the primitive ritual of the other sacrament.

The difference between baptism by immersion and baptism by pouring is simply the natural difference

between the East and the West, between a warm country and a cold one. All that is essential in baptism is that water shall be used, with the utterance of certain words of Christ.

2. The Episcopal Church holds that baptism may be administered to infants.

(1.) Against the ministration of baptism to infants stands the argument of silence. Concerning infant baptism there is neither precept nor example in the New Testament. And this silence is emphasized by certain words of significant speech, in which two spiritual qualifications, repentance and faith, both alike impossible to infants, are set down as a necessary requisite to the right reception of this sacrament. But this silence of Holy Scripture, what does it mean? And these forbidding words, what do they signify?

It is evident, whatever may have been the practice in the ministry of the apostles, that, up to that era in religious history, little children were admitted into the Church of God. Jesus Christ himself, by circumcision, which was the initiatory counterpart of baptism, was thus received into the Church when he was eight days old. There have been two doors of entrance into the Church. In the Jewish dispensation the door was circumcision; in the Christian dispensation the door is baptism. And the Jewish door, plainly enough, swung open at the touch of the smallest child.

It is evident, also, whatever Christ and the Twelve may have said or left unsaid, that since that era in religious history, little children have continuously and by almost universal consent been admitted into the Church.

The natural inference is that the Church's invitation to the children, which was plainly given up to the very days of the apostles and has been just as plainly given ever since, was given then. The probability is that it never occurred to any of the apostles that the receiving of little children into the covenant of God would ever be questioned by anybody. From time out of mind, they and their fathers before them had never heard of any other custom.

Of course, they were chiefly interested, as all missionaries in pagan lands are interested to-day, in the converting and baptizing of grown men and women. The Acts of the Apostles reads like the record of the work of the missionaries of the Episcopal Church in any new land to-day. Everybody needed to be baptized, the grown people first. Nothing was said about the babies.

We must remember, moreover, that most of the new converts were Jews. To the Jew it was just as beautiful and significant a thing as it is to us that parents and children should stand together within the covenant of God. If any change had been made in such a matter, if the new dispensation had been narrower than the old, if there had appeared such a singular phenomenon as a Church for grown-up people only, if the new Church had opposed itself so sharply to this cherished privilege of the old, there would have been anything but silence. The people would have protested as they did in less important matters; their protest would have required an answer; and that answer would have found a place in the pages of the New Testament.

We need no stronger assurance that the little Chris-

tian children were just as lovingly received into the Christian Church as the little Jewish children were into the Jewish Church, than this remarkable silence. The silence means that the old passed on into the new unchanged.

(2). What shall we say, however, to the requisites of repentance and faith? Repent and be baptized; believe first, and then be baptized; the little children cannot meet either of these requirements.

But repent and believe before baptism—why? Why, because baptism is an initiation into this great religious society, the Church. And the Church exists for two great purposes, to abolish sin and to defend the faith. The Church is an Anti-Sin Society, and a Truth-Defense Society. But to get these two great purposes accomplished the Church must be made up of people who are in sympathy with them. The members of the Church must set themselves against sin, and must agree in maintaining certain great truths about God. The Church, accordingly, following the word of the Master and the example of the apostles, tests those who present themselves for admission by their loyalty to these two essential purposes. Inquiry is made as to repentance, in order that nobody may get into the Anti-Sin Society who is not against sin, in his own heart first. Inquiry is also made concerning faith, that nobody may get into the Truth-Defense Society who is not willing to join us in bearing witness to those great affirmations which we have held in trust since the days when men saw with their eyes, and heard with their ears, the plain manifestation, the revelation of God.

This, then, is what repentance and faith mean as connected with baptism. They are set as tests beside the gate to keep out of the Church those who are not worthy, or who are not ready, to come in. The father comes, repenting and believing, the mother comes, repenting and believing; but here is the little child. The defensive tests do not touch the child. What, then, to do? The Church Catechism answers the question: "Why, then, are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age, they cannot perform them? Because they promise them both by their sureties, which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform." The father, the mother, the sponsors, say—We will see to it that this child is brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life. We will answer for his hostility to sin, and his loyalty to truth so far as in us lies. And thus the purpose of the two initiatory tests is met, and the little child is admitted to the Church.

3. The Episcopal Church believes not only that children ought to be baptized, but that in the act of baptism they are regenerated. Immediately after the administration of this sacrament, the minister bids the congregation to join him in a thanksgiving for the child's regeneration.

(1.) The word "regeneration" comes into the baptismal office out of the third chapter of the Gospel of St. John, and out of the Epistle which St. Paul wrote to Titus. "Except a man be born again (regenerated)—of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." "When the kindness of God our Saviour, and his love toward man, appeared, not by

works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." These passages may or may not have a direct bearing upon the sacrament of baptism. It is sufficient for our present purpose that they have always been recognized as singularly applicable to this sacrament, and that they have given the Church this significant word in which the benefits of baptism seem to be summed up and included. Baptism is always baptism, whether it be administered to a child or to an adult. And the blessing of baptism is indicated by the Episcopal Church in the word "regeneration."

When we come, however, to inquire exactly what regeneration means, the Church returns no answer. It is evident from the use of the word in Holy Scripture that it was never intended to be the basis of a doctrinal definition. It belongs not to the domain of mathematics, of logic, of scientific theology, but rather to the world of poetry, of illustration, of the imagination. We ought to know better than to make the mistake of Nicodemus and to try to read it literally. In baptism we are "born again." That is not a statement in physiology.

The higher we get in the scale of truth, the more do we become aware of the inadequateness of literal definitions. In mathematics and in physical science it is possible to formulate a description which shall include all the facts and leave nothing out; so that we may say, this is absolutely true, and no other statement, differing from this, can possibly be true at all. But try this method with one of Beethoven's sympho-

nies. It is plain at once that here we are beyond the reach of definition. A thousand things may be said about this beautiful music; a thousand attempts may be made to set forth the charm that it has for us, and the delight that it gives us. And yet there is room for more. After all is said, the half has not been told. Nobody can formulate an adequate definition of a piece of music.

We are conscious of the same incompetence of language in regard to all the higher truths. No great picture nor statue nor book, no great emotion, nor strong feeling, no supreme joy or sorrow can be adequately expressed in any number of formal sentences. Love eludes definition. Patriotism is above all constitutions and by-laws. These high matters are to be thought about endlessly, with boundless variety in our thinking, with no limit to the possibility of our discovery. Nobody has ever said, nor will ever say, all that can be said about them.

Somehow, we are slow to see that the great truths of religion are as incapable of adequate definition as these other great truths. We are all the time making the mistake of thinking that religious truth is truth of a low order, that it belongs with physics and arithmetic, that the creeds and the sacraments are like sticks and stones, and the words of Christ like the statements of the multiplication table; whereas, religious truth is of the very highest order, and belongs with music, and poetry, and art, and patriotism, and honor, and love, absolutely out of the reach of any adequate definition. The good theologians of the Middle Ages were quite sure that the Inquisition was

in possession of the whole mind of God. They were as certain of their definitions in theology as they were of their definitions in science—and as mistaken. After all their instructive blunders, we are still in search of adequate theological definition.

The Episcopal Church has provided a way out of this old error by the use of the word "regeneration." For here is a wide word, taken out of the language of poetry and capable of innumerable applications. The word "regeneration" limits no man's thinking. It attempts no theological definition. In spite of all endeavors to get it down into the field of mathematical theology it still swings free as the stars. It sets forth no sacramental doctrine. To be baptized is to be born again. What a boundless area is here thrown open for the devout imagination, for the meditation of the Christian! Baptism, the Church says, is regeneration; and the word sets the door wide for everybody's absolutely untrammelled study.

(2.) One thing is quite clear about baptism; whatever else baptism does, it initiates us into the Church of Christ. It makes us members of Christ. Baptism is an adoption into the family of God. It makes us children of God. Baptism is the bringing of a human soul into the midst of spiritual influences. It makes us inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.

Evidently, baptism is an entrance into the Church; and that is, in a real way, an entrance into a new life. Whatever else regeneration may mean, it may very properly mean this. Initiation into this great spiritual society is a being born again. It represents a new environment.

It is not easy to over-estimate the influences of environment. The difference is immeasurable which results from the birth of one child into one family and the birth of another child into another and very different family. The chances are enormous that the family environment will absolutely shape and determine the child's destiny. In a wider field, see what environment does in the development of nationality. There is an actual difference, not to be accounted for by any considerations of geography or history, between a Frenchman and an Englishman, between an Italian and a Russian, between a citizen of Pittsburg and a citizen of Constantinople. This difference is due to the influence of environment.

Now, baptism puts a child into a certain environment. The child is made a member of the Christian Church. Henceforth he is to be surrounded by Christian associations. Promises are made, as a condition of admission, that all pains will be taken to train him up in a godly and a Christian life. The change which has come upon this child, as compared with another, left in the irreligious world, is like a removal from central Africa to London, or like an adoption out of the slums into a cultured home. Of course, the child may not be receptive to these uplifting influences, or there may be some defect in the application of the influences; the Church or the child may be at fault; but, in a majority of instances, this change of environment of which baptism is the sign, will and does, amount to a new birth. It deserves the name regeneration.

Fortunately, the benedictions of baptism do not de-

pend upon the accuracy of our theological information. We get the blessing all the same whether we understand what it is or not. All our study, all our controversy, will not change the nature of baptism. The doctrine of baptism and the blessing of baptism do not go, of necessity, together. Doctrines depend upon men's spiritual insight. As we grow, we come to know more, and to see more, and our doctrines change. That doctrine is most in contradiction to the spirit of the Episcopal Church, which says "This is the one, true and final explanation," and leaves no room for any further Christian thinking.

§ 2. Concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Episcopal Church teaches that it was ordained "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby;" and that in the Lord's Supper "our souls are strengthened and refreshed by the Body and Blood of Christ as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine." The Lord's Supper is accordingly held to be both a sacrament of remembrance and a sacrament of strength.

1. All Christians agree in regarding the Lord's Supper as the Sacrament of Remembrance. The bread is broken, the wine is poured, the words of institution are repeated, and all our hearts are in the upper room, in the presence of the Master, in the shadow of the Cross.

(1). The remembrance is of the death of Christ; yet not of his death as separated from his life, rather as including, interpreting, summing up all that Jesus said and did in all his ministry. The fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man, the love that we

ought to have toward him and toward each other, the mystery and the iniquity of sin, and the possibility of pardon are all taught from the pulpit of the Cross and ought all to be present in our remembrance of the death of Christ.

Thus the act of remembrance is profoundly ethical. It has its influence not only in the direction of emotion but of conduct. The memory of the death of Christ calls us to self-examination. The sacrament becomes an occasion for renewal of our hatred of sin, and of our love toward our brethren. So emphatic is the ethical meaning of the Lord's Supper, that the Episcopal Church makes careful provision that none shall come to it in whom a desire for better living is not found. Open and notorious evil livers are advertised that they presume not to come to the Lord's Table until they have openly declared themselves to have truly repented and amended their former evil life. Those betwixt whom malice and hatred are seen to reign are not suffered to be partakers of the Lord's Table until they are reconciled. All who come are exhorted to try and examine themselves lest they be found at this Sacrament of Remembrance forgetful of their own duty toward him who died that he might bring more love into this unbrotherly world and save us from our sins.

Nevertheless, it ought to be said here that the Church does not account ethical perfection to be essential to the right reception of the sacrament; else there would be no receivers. Much is said in preface and exhortation to emphasize St. Paul's words about the danger of receiving the sacrament unworthily. But unworthiness is to be measured not so much by the

number of good deeds done or of bad deeds left undone, as by the desire of the heart. In the penitential confession before the receiving of the sacrament we all say that we are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under the table of the Lord. It was not this kind of unworthiness that St. Paul had in mind. What the Corinthians were rebuked for was irreverence. They had come to the Lord's Table as carelessly as to their own suppers, some of them even venturing into intoxication. They had not "discerned" the Lord's Body; that is, they had made no difference between the bread of the Lord's Supper and any common bread. Whoever comes thus thoughtlessly, irreverently, unmindful of the religious nature of the service, a forgetful partaker of the Sacrament of Remembrance, comes unworthily. But whoever recognizes his own unworthiness and laments it, whoever remembers the Cross with love and his own life with shame, whoever desires to draw nearer to Christ and serve him better, he may come; the sacrament is meant for him.

(2). The word "remembrance" must also be taken to include the idea of memorial. That is, it means not only the act of remembering, but the act of signifying our remembrance. In this sense it is like a memorial service in honor of a saint or hero. The Lord's Supper is thus a manifestation of our Christian loyalty. It is the one supreme distinctive service of the Christian Church. All our other worship we have made up out of our own minds and hearts; this he ordained, who was the Founder of the Church. The Lord's Supper is the Christian counterpart of the old sacrifices. They looked forward toward the altar of the Cross, and

this looks back. They were services of anticipation; this is the service of commemoration. Christ on the cross made the one perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. In this sacrament we partake of that sacrifice. Thus the memorial is said to be not only of Christ but of his death, his sacrificial death. This he asked us to do in his memory. It is for our sake and for his sake that we do it. It is one plain way we have of coming near to him and of testifying that we do remember him, that we do love and adore him.

2. The Lord's Supper is also the Sacrament of Strength. It was ordained not merely to be looked at, but to be received. The giving of the bread and wine into the hands of the communicants is a sign and pledge of the benediction of God.

That which we receive is indeed plain bread and wine: our senses tell us that. Yet Christ called it his body and his blood, and St. Paul calls the receiving of it the "communion," or partaking, of the body and blood of Christ. The bread was, of course, his body only in the sense in which the cup was the "new covenant." These two assertions of Christ must be interpreted according to the same method. Jesus, evidently, did not mean that the cup was literally a covenant; that is, a testament, a will. We do not any of us believe that the cup was changed by miracle into a piece of parchment, having a will written upon it, nor even that it was in some mysterious way a cup and a piece of parchment at the same time. The cup was a symbol of the covenant. The words are used in metaphor. The bread was a symbol of the body.

Yet there is clearly a blessing associated with this bread and wine. The Corinthians were rebuked, as we have seen, for making no difference between this bread and other bread, for not discerning the Lord's body. Plainly, there is a difference.

This question has made the sacrament of the Lord's Supper the occasion of long controversy. The sacrament of brotherly love has been made the occasion of much unbrotherly contention. This is not bread and wine, say some, this is the actual body and blood of Christ. We ought to worship Christ present on the altar. This is not the body and blood of Christ, say others, it is only common bread and wine. The presence of Christ is only in our hearts.

The Episcopal Church is able to sympathize with the truths which lie on each side of this old disputation. "The bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." And yet, "the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith."

That is, with our hands and lips we receive the bread and wine, and with our hearts we receive, so far as our hearts are open to receive it, that benediction of spiritual fellowship which Jesus associated with the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood. "I will dwell in him and he in me." And that means spiritual strength.

The Lord's Supper is the Sacrament of Strength. It helps us. We go out from it uplifted in heart and

mind. We meet temptation better after this meeting with the Master. We know that. How the help comes, matters little. Certain it is, the benediction is not proportioned to our theological information. Whether we follow the fathers of Trent or the fathers of Westminster, the sacrament remains the same.

3. Concerning the ritual of this sacrament, the Episcopal Church shows a wide latitude. It is celebrated upon a table or upon an altar. The officiating minister, who is attired either in a surplice or in a chasuble, stands either before the table facing eastward, or behind the table facing westward. Sometimes the service is read by daylight, sometimes by candle-light. Here there are flowers; there there are no flowers. This one reads the prayers; that one sings or intones them.

Some people object to this variety of ritual. The daylight people would have no candles. The chasuble people would have no standing behind tables. But all this variety exists in the Church, and the wisest people are glad of it. After all, it is true that there are only two kinds of churchmen—broad and narrow. The broad churchmen are those who recognize the fact of difference, who see plainly that God has not made us all alike. We are not all helped by simplicity, though some are. We are not all helped by incense and processional crosses, though some are. The peculiar glory of the Episcopal Church is that there is place within her borders for all sorts of people, and a welcome for every kind of temperament, and a ministry for every variety of man. The only kind of ritual which seriously contradicts the spirit of the Episcopal

Church is that which exalts itself above righteousness, which sets more emphasis on colors than it does on charity, and which cares more for mint, anise, and cummin than it does for judgment, mercy, truth and brotherly love.

Indeed, these pages have quite failed of their purpose if they have not shown that the Episcopal Church is built like the pattern which St. John saw in the Revelation, four-square, facing the four corners of the earth, and with three doors on every side, and these doors wide open, so that there is far more door than wall. To keep the Church from narrowness, from pettiness, from lapsing into sectarianism; to preserve its catholicity, its recognition of the difference between the essential and the non-essential, its relation to all the varying needs of human nature, its spiritual sanity, its religious hospitality—this is what we must do if we would have the Church of the English-speaking people of the past to be the Church of the English speaking people of the future.

BHL 13422
38